CANDOUR

The British Views-Letter

Founded by A. K. Chesterton in 1953 to defend National Sovereignty against the menace of International Finance

Vol. XXXIV, No. 1 *Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper* January, 1983

CONSPIRACY '82

No year ends without the patriot being able to look back and say that it has proved to be one in which assaults on our sovereignty have been painfully revealed for all who are prepared to believe the evidence of their eyes. It is not necessary to reflect on more than the last two or three months of 1982 to note essential signposts marking what A. K. Chesterton called "the dual carriage-way to Hell".

PAX OF LIES — In a week that *The Times* reported a further thirty Russian nuclear missiles being installed to boost that country's enormous conventional forces, the publication of the Church of England's report, *The Church and the Bomb,* was immediately shown to be an act of political tomfoolery . . . and a very dangerous one, at that. Assuming an avowedly unilateralist position, it said that renunciation of our (perhaps "our" would be more appropriate when we ponder on the extent to which the "finger on the trigger" is American) nuclear deterrent would positively assist the process of disarmament.

What rot! We suspect most of the Church's Board for Social (Ir)responsibility, whose working party produced the report, are so taken up with the notion of "giving a moral lead" that they have not paused to consider to what extent their viewpoint is a valid proposition in the real world of power politics. Do they imagine the butchers of the Kremlin are occupied with moral considerations? It is all very well to argue that nuclear weapons are morally reprehensible and totally impermissable for Christians. But if the primary intention is not to kill the enemy, except in extreme circumstances — rather, to maintain the peace — then any immorality about possessing nuclear weapons with the *improbable* intention of using them is only a small fraction of the immorality of *actually* using them.

Any sane person would support negotiations likely to lead to a balanced and simultaneous reduction of all kinds of armaments. But such an agreement can only be achieved if there is a strong incentive for the Russians to negotiate: namely, that in possessing nuclear weapons the West is resolute to convey the impression that in some circumstances it would use them. The idea that unilateral renunciation of "our" nuclear armoury — or that of any non-Communist nation — is likely to produce a matching response from an expansionist, atheistic communist power flies in the face of reality, experience and common sense. We imagine the Anglican clergymen who wrote the report on "the Bomb" have not heard how fifteen Russians who tried to form an equivalent of a C.N.D. movement in Moscow earlier this year were immediately slapped in gaol.

A ROSE BY ANY OTHER NAME — Mention of Russia prompts us to ask readers if, like the *Candour* staff, they firmly withstood the media-inspired temptation to catch their breath along with the rest of the world on the death of Leonid Brezhnev. The demise of a tyrant should cause no-one to feel regret. His 68-year-old successor (a remarkable juvenile compared to the geriatric membership of the Politburo) has been well-known to the Candour Research Department files for some time. For the evil-eyed, ex-K.G.B. chief, Yuri V. Andropov, who is closely associated with the darkest chapters of Soviet oppression, was born with the name Liebermann. Not a word about this aspect of Comrade "Andropov's" past has appeared in any newspaper that we have read. However, a chink in the curtain appeared on Radio Four's *Today* programme on the morning of November 16th when a specialist on K.G.B. affairs let slip to his interviewer that one of the four languages spoken by the new Soviet dictator is Yiddish.

JUDICIOUS TIMING — The circumstances surrounding the Pope's visit to Spain are something of an enigma. Although arranged well in advance, the visit was postponed because of the Spanish general election on account of the premise that his presence would have benefitted the rightist parties. If the *actual* visit was to be a neutral affair, then its postponement clearly was not, for that could be taken as an *anti*-rightist tactic. Then when the Socialists, with their policies of abortion, divorce and state interference in Church education, had won an overwhelming victory, the Pope did arrive and spoke out strongly against

abortion, divorce and state interference in Church education . . . at the same time urging respect for the "new era" government! Very likely the effect of his words on immoral laws on the left-wing gang now in control in Madrid will be nil. But the "Popeist" conservatives will be placated, being able to claim him as a champion of sound doctrine. John Paul II is so consistently *in*effective in safeguarding what remains of the Church's traditions, faith and morals that it really makes us wonder.

A poisonous editorial in the *Catholic Herald* discussed approvingly the revolution in Spain since Franco's death and looked back on the Republican regime that preceded the *Caudillo* in the 'thirties as 'moderate". Tell that to the spirits of the thousands of priests and nuns who were slaughtered amid the ruins of their burning churches! By some strange process of logic the writer managed to imply that the Church of the time was responsible for the country's *braceros* — its landless peasants — being reduced to eating grass to stay alive. That they did *not* face starvation under Franco's rule would suggest that the much malgned dictator improved things just a little bit, although it has to be faced that during his years in office he neglected to implement the very necessary radical economic proposals of the original Falangist movement and remained essentially a conservative fascist. Marshall Aid didn't help much, either, since they never balanced their budgets after! Spaniards, of course, just *may* be granted another Franco, but after voting as they did in their election they hardly deserve one.

CASTLE'S COMPROMISE — The Labour Party is hedging its bets again on Britain's membership of the Common Market, if a television interview of Michael Foot on October 3rd is anything to go by. When asked whether we would be in or out of the E.E.C. by the end of his party's next term of office (assuming it wins the next election), he made it clear that withdrawal might not be among the first priorities. Whatever the claims of some die-soft anti-Marketeers about the virtues of "playing politics" and working to instal a Labour Government in order that it might secure withdrawal from the Common Market (haven't they learnt *anything* from the Referendum con-trick of 1975?), the party's equivocal attitude to the E.E.C. has always been far more decisively influenced by the substantial group of M.P.s who argue that Britain should stay in and press for "reforms". The latest advocate of this tactic, we are amused to note, is the veteran "anti-Marketeer and leader of the Labour group in the European Parliamentary Gasworks, Mrs. Barbara Castle . . . who once admitted to an Empire Loyalist heckler that she had not read the Treaty of Rome!

Mrs. Castle's "reformist" clique are basing their views on the statement of some members of the Cambridge school of economists that a future Labour government should remain in the E.E.C., work for a stronger and reflationary European Monetary System, and accept the Common Agricultural Policy in return for an industrial policy granting Britain some leeway in interventionist measures designed to curb our "de-industrialisation". The monstrous C.A.P. should be an *un*acceptable proposition for even the most chicken-hearted opponent of the Common Market because of the way in which it eats up the majority of E.E.C. spending and produces massive surpluses of food which have to be disposed of at a massive loss and with the aid of massive subsidies, more often than not to the Soviet Union — whose rulers, not lacking in capitalist unscrupulousness, sell them to their subject people at a massive profit! As for any concessions on industrial policy, the E.E.C. Commission is unlikely to drop its pro-internationalist free trading principles merely to satisfy a Labour government.

Evidence for this conviction came on November 26th in the form of the European Commission's decision that every E.E.C. country will have to agree further cuts in its steel production capacity by next June. Britain will *have* to be included, even though we have cut *nearly half* of the 106,000 steel jobs lost in the Community's ten member-states over the last three years. So much for the claims about "no erosion of essential sovereignty" uttered by chinless Tory wonders at Common Market "seminars" a decade ago. The same applies to our mortally wounded fishing industry. On the same day, incredibly, as the news about the proposed loss of more steel jobs, the President of the European Commission, Gaston Thorn, had the temerity to tell a press conference "celebrating" ten years of Market slavery that withdrawal would be a "terrible mistake" and lead to more unemployment! The need now is as pressing as it has ever been to pull out of the E.E.C. in the shortest possible time and seek to renew those trading links with our sister-nations overseas that were shamefully broken as the price for Common Market entry.

BANKERS' NEW ORDER — In October our old and valued friend Revilo Oliver wrote to ask us if it is true that English banks now charge £2 to cash personal cheques on an American bank. We

replied to state that he was right and sent a newspaper cutting in confirmation. The description he gave in his letter of the fruitless enquiries he made about avoiding the charge when making remittance is worth repeating:

"That [the £2 charge] seemed absurd to me, so I went down to a local bank that wants my account and in the past always wrote me a draft in sterling on London whenever I wanted it. They said that the Federal Reserve has compelled them to charge a minimum of $17.50 for a draft payable abroad. So I went to the post office, where one could buy an international money order for a small fee in the past, and I found that not only has the fee been greatly increased but now one must fill out an application begging for permission to send money abroad and explaining why one wants to send it and why one thinks the purpose legitimate. One pays the post office, which then sends it and the application to a nest of bureaucrats in St. Louis who, if they graciously grant the serf permission to send money and approve his reason for doing so, will send an international money order directly to the foreign address."

What is happening is the obvious fact that the perpetrators of the banking fraud are making progress toward their goal of keeping their cattle docile and imprisoned in their respective plantations. It is *less* obvious whether some process of cogitation will be stimulated in the skulls of the poor boobs when some resented trouble-maker tells them what is happening. Or will they just stare incredulously?

A. K. SPEAKS

A C.60 cassette tape of A. K. Chesterton speaking on the menace of International Finance.

Introduced by Leslie Greene,

ONLY £3.00 FROM

Candour Publishing Company,
Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire.

FOR SALE: LARGE COLLECTION OF PRE- AND POST-WAR BOOKS AND JOURNALS OF INTEREST TO NATIONALISTS. SEND S.A.E. FOR LIST TO: THE CANDOUR LIBRARY, FOREST HOUSE, LISS FOREST, HAMPSHIRE.

THE DUKE AND BARON ROTHSCHILD

Those of you who are readers of the *Sunday Express* will probably have noted on October 17th the following interesting passage from the serialisation of Stephen Birmingham's book *Duchess: The Story of Wallis Warfield Windsor.*

"The Duke had originally intended to stay in an hotel in Switzerland. But his aide throughout the abdication crisis, Lord Perry Brownlow, had been able to find him better accommodation. The Baron and Baroness Eugene de Rothschild had a castle called Schloss Enzesfeld near Vienna, and even though considerable work was involved in order to open up a large estate that had been closed for some time, the Rothschilds agreed to take him in . . .

"One reason why the Baron de Rothschild tolerated his rude and ungrateful guest was the Duke's announcement that one of his projects, now that the king business was out of the way, would be to write a book in defence of the Jews. Rothschild was delighted with the idea . . . In the library, the would-be author spent a great deal of time planning the appearance of the book — it was to be bound in royal blue Morocco and the cover would bear the coat of arms of the Prince of Wales . . ."

Prior to seeing these extracts, we were of the opinion that Edward VIII's departure from the throne was a regrettable obligation. Now we are not so sure — except that the promised defence never appeared! We cannot feel that it wouldn't have found a publisher so we must conclude that it was never written. St. st. put not your trust in (*all*) princes even if you *are* a Rothschild.

MORE ON STRASSER

"My rejection on principle of any kind of Bolshevism (and of the Marxism on which it is based), together with my insistence on the maintenance of individual rights, creative initiative, and the pursuit of economic gain, must protect me against an erroneous interpretation of my demand for the subdivision of great landed estates and the nationalisation of monopolist industry.

"Whoever recognises the truth of the saying 'Property makes free', whoever affirms the necessity for a sustaining stratum in any satisfactory social order — must look forward to the new order which will aim at the de-proletarianisation of the people, and at our liberation from the social and economic monopolies under whose harrow no sort of freedom is possible." — Otto Strasser, *Germany Tomorrow* (1940), pp. 65-6.

UNENDED BATTLE

by HUGH McNEILE

This year — the month of October to be precise — marks the thirtieth anniversary of Candour's founding. To commemorate three decades of continuous campaigning, we are presenting in the next few issues a serialised history of Candour and the dynamic patriotic movement born out of it: the League of Empire Loyalists — Editor.

Although *Candour* was founded in 1953 and the League of Empire Loyalists a year later, the *Candour*-League movement's origins may be traced back nine years earlier to 1944 when A. K. Chesterton became Deputy Editor of *Truth*. He had taken up the position after being invalided out of the Army with malaria and colitis, which he had contracted during service in Somalia where he was in the vanguard of the fighting that led to the rout of the Italians.

Truth was a weekly journal founded in the 1870s by Henry Labouchere. It specialised in a particular brand of vigorous, independent journalism that possessed a John Bull quality in its proclamation of the virtues and values of the British Empire. The *Manchester Guardian* once described it as being "almost the last remaining home of the declining art of invective." A polemical writer of A.K.'s calibre could not have felt out of place on its staff with his talents in that field!

A particularly objectionable effort was made shortly after he joined *Truth* to have A.K. removed. A deputation of Jews called on Collin Brooks, the journal's Editor, with the very strong suggestion that he should dismiss A.K. from his service. Evidently, not all his political foes had forgiven him for his links with the Mosley movement in the heady days of the mid-1930s. But Brooks, being the man he was, would have none of it; indeed, he made A.K. his principal leader-writer with a free hand to interpret home and world affairs as he thought appropriate. A.K. also undertook reviews and articles on the arts, greatly impressing people such as Anthony Quayle and Christopher Fry with his writing.

While helping to edit *Truth*, A.K. was also running a newsletter called *London Tidings* (he had taken over the Editor's chair from Douglas Reed), contributing to the Duke of Bedford's monthly magazine *People's Post* and, for ten years, writing regular articles on international affairs for the *Journal of the Royal United Services Institution* till these were discontinued because of the displeasure they met in high places. In April 1953, A.K. became literary adviser and personal journalist to Lord Beaverbrook. Part of his duties in this post included regularly contributing features and leaders to the *Daily Express*, *Sunday Express* and *Evening Standard*. There can be little doubt that his journalistic prowess — his polemical writing was of the top rank — could have enabled him to make a highly successful and lucrative career in Fleet Street had his selfless political drive not diverted his boundless energies and talents in another direction.

Candour Supersedes Truth

In 1953, *Truth* was acquired by the Staples Press. This led to many thousands of pounds being pumped into the journal for technical improvement, making it a larger and more attractive-looking proposition on the news-stands. But with new management came pressure for a new editorial policy in line with the internationalist thinking of the Conservative Party's post-war leadership. The consequence was that both Collin Brooks and A. K. Chesterton resigned. A.K. issued a statement, entitled *Truth Has Been Murdered*, to a number of readers in which he set down his objections to the changes demanded of himself and Brooks in their editorial line. It also carried an invitation to join in helping to create a new journal in the old style of *Truth* and recipients were asked to inform him what sums they were prepared to put up.

The response was not as enthusiastic as had been hoped and the project might have been still-born had it not been for a £1,000 cheque received from a millionaire Englishman domiciled in Chile who had made his fortune from the nitrate industry. His name was Robert Key Jeffery. With promises of a further £750 from supporters, A.K. called a meeting in the summer of 1953 to set up a group of sponsors. Foremost among them was Elizabeth Lady Freeman. widow of Air Chief Marshall Sir Wilfred Rhodes Freeman. Further backing for a new journal was secured in writing in the days after the meeting, putting A.K. in a position to proceed with its launching. As *Truth's* successor, it was to be called, appropriately, *Candour*.

Candour made its first appearance on October 30th, 1953. It expressed throughout distinctively patriotic views about the changing world of the post-war years in which British influence and power were under attack. The first leader, 'Sound The Alarm', pulled no punches in exposing the undermining of

Britain's power overseas. 1954 was entered with all guns blazing. A.K.'s attacks against traitorous politicians gave no quarter and were aimed at pretty well the whole House of Commons.

Candour's launching had one personal repercussion for A.K.: within forty-eight hours Lord Beaverbrook informed him that his contract as the press lord's personal adviser would not be renewed. Until it expired, he did not append his name to articles out of deference to his employer. Instead, the Shakespearian *nom-de-plume* Philip Faulconbridge was used. When out of Beaverbrook's employ, A.K. soon criticised him for insufficiently espousing the cause of Empire. Subsequently, the League of Empire Loyalists was to have a number of clashes with 'The Beaver'.

Within months, cheques for £5,000 and then £10,000 were received from R. K. Jeffery in Chile, enabling *Candour's* size to be doubled and its price halved to eightpence. Grants were made by A.K. to various small Right-wing groups, such as the Britons Publishing Society and the Birmingham Nationalist Club. At this time, the subscription list was boosted by a transfer of readers from the *People's Post*, following the death of its patron, the Duke of Bedford. The Editor of the *People's Post* had been John Beckett, a former Labour M.P. who had been a close colleague of A.K. in the British Union. The Duke of Bedford's small political party, the British People's Party, also failed to survive his death and provided a source of recruits when the L.E.L. was formed.

As 1954 progressed, *Candour's* nature was becoming more and more clear. It was following in the tradition of what Hilaire Belloc meant, just after World War I, when he referred to the "free press" — little 'papers, unsubsidised by advertisements, consequently running at a loss and necessarily not of mass appeal. There were other regular contributors: Derek Tozer wrote about various United Nations agencies, Aidan Mackay on education, the Church and the Jews, and Noel Stock on monetary reform. Later issues were to carry articles by Cecile von Goetz, Mark Ellen, Auberon Waugh, Otto Strasser, John Bean and John Mitchell. But *Candour* was essentially A. K. Chesterton's platform. Much of his writing was motivated by indignation and, consequently, *Candour* became known as an 'angry' 'paper. Some transient readers saw this as a handicap, but not so A.K. It was the very image he sought.

Raising A Hornet's Nest

It was in an attempt to secure a more active response to *Candour's* clarion call that A. K. Chesterton founded the League of Empire Loyalists.

The L.E.L. was not meant to be a new political party. A.K. believed that all parties outside those sheltering under establishment patronage were destined to suffer an infant mortality rate of one hundred per cent. New parties, to have any potential for success, require gifted leadership, wealthy patrons and dedicated members, and if there *are* signs of significant advance, squabbles over policy and influxes of old-party opportunists invariably act as brakes on further progress. All that would result from *Candour* sponsoring a new party, A.K. argued, would be another group of "racketeers", expediency-mongers and slogan-shouters".

His proposal, therefore, was to form a pressure-group which would force upon existing parties policies favourable to national and imperial survival. He did not elaborate on the type of lobbying to be employed, except to say that the group would "raise such a hornets' nest under any public man who dared to speak or act against British sovereignty as to put him in fear of his political career". The initiative for action was to rest with the membership itself, singly or in groups, as they would need to keep a vigilant watch on their M.P.s. In urging such grass roots strategy. A.K. presumably did not see the League being centrally directed in its activities, as it almost entirely turned out to be. No particular economic or social blue-prints were to be offered. Essentially a defensive action would be fought; otherwise, members' energies might be dissipated in argument. Overseas development was held to be crucial.

The League was officially launched at Caxton Hall, Westminster, on April 13th, 1954. Membership was open to British subjects throughout the world and it was hoped to recruit 20,000 members (the subscription was five shillings a year). The membership goal looked attainable. Under pressure from New York, Britain was only just beginning to shed her imperial responsibilities and accept a diminished role in world affairs. It seemed as if the League was coming into being at just the appropriate psychological contact point for patriotically-minded individuals disturbed at this threatening manifestation. Furthermore, the new flavour of the Conservative Party's leadership made it look likely that the L.E.L. might attract dissident Tories concerned at the scrapping of many traditional attitudes.

R. K. Jeffery's munificence enabled a Central London office to be opened at 602 Grand Buildings, Northumberland Avenue, although the League moved in December 1955 to 11 Palace Chambers, Bridge Street (opposite Parliament), where it stayed

till the merger with the British National Party to form the National Front. A full-time organiser was employed. This person was Leslie Greene, a bright young graduate in classics of St. Andrew's University and in history of London University. She was a cousin of novelist Graham Greene and Sir Hugh Greene, a Director-General of the B.B.C. As Public Relations Officer, A.K. chose Aidan Mackay, a Catholic Distributist of the 'Chester-Belloc' school. Although he remained throughout a League leader, and was Deputy-Chairman of the National Front until 1970, Aidan left the League's employment after only a year to return to a successful career in teaching.

Another appointment was Austen Brooks in the dual role of Deputy Editor of *Candour* and Campaign Director for the League. The son of Collin Brooks, he had also worked on *Truth* and resigned at the same time as A.K. and his father, becoming a sub-editor on the *Yorkshire Post.* An ex-Navy officer, he possessed a tall, imposing figure, resplendent with a bushy red beard. He involved himself fully in the later rough-and-tumble of League activities, while writing a weekly home affairs column for *Candour* in which he concentrated on the shortcomings of bureaucracy, the lot of the small businessman, trade union malpractices, and our threatened industries. He also became the League's Honorary Treasurer.

The League's first Annual General Meeting, held on October 16th, 1954, was well attended, as was the first *Candour* dinner in the evening. A seventeen-strong National Executive Committee was elected to manage and direct the League, including A. K. Chesterton, Austen Brooks, Leslie Greene, Derek Tozer and Lady Freeman. Martin Burdett-Coutts, of the famous banking family, was elected Chairman. The Executive met monthly, but real power rested in the hands of an inner Policy Committee consisting of the League Chairman, Secretary and Editor of *Candour,* for the latter possessed the right to over-rule the Executive, to suspend or expel members or branches, and to take day-to-day decisions about running the movement and planning activities. Before long, the Policy Committee's efforts to draw the public's attention to the League's case were to secure newspaper headlines at home and overseas.

Next issue: INTO ACTION — the League starts campaigning.

Read Derek Holland's "A. K. Chesterton: Radical Nationalist" in issue 12 of NATIONALISM TODAY. Available from 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon, Surrey, price 57p.

STILL MORE SURVIVORS?

This writer was in West Germany recently and on the morning of November 5th switched on his radio to listen to the B.B.C. London 07.00 news report. He heard that a German living in Canada since 1950 who is a Canadian citizen was being extradited to West Germany to stand trial, on account that he had killed or had effected action resulting in the deaths of several hundred Lithuanian Jews during the Third Reich. The name of the 'German' was not given. But it was noted by this writer that the B.B.C. commentator said that he was a Canadian citizen. How then, technically, could this man still be a German?

As he is interested to keep in touch with the 'maelstrom' of world topics, this writer makes a habit when in Germany of listening to A.F.N. (the American Forces Network) with its H.Q. at Frankfurt-am-Main, West Germany. The A.F.N. News at 13.00 hours had an interesting report to give on this 'German' from Canada. Now note this — the American officer reading that news cast at one o'clock on this same day of November spoke about the 'German' as being a one-time *inmate* of a 'concentration camp', having been interned as an orphan by the Nazis because he was the son of a gypsy. He was being charged with having caused the death of *eleven* fellow-inmates, all Jews, during his incarceration. He had already been removed from Canada and was standing trial in the court of Fulda, charged with that offence. The A.F.N. report went further, stating that 'witnesses' in Israel and America were refusing to travel to Germany to testify and so German 'officials' would instead travel to Israel and the U.S.A. to hear witnesses' reports.

Now anybody reading this must surely ask themselves just where did the B.B.C. obtain its version of the story so at variance with the report from the American Forces Network? This writer is tempted to ask the B.B.C. what it is all about. Is a Zionist influence at work in Broadcasting House, with reports conducive to the perpetuation of the 'Holocaust' claim?

The American news-cast stated that the trial is expected to last five months and quite obviously will cost the German tax-payer a lot of money. The accused — whoever he is we shall know sooner or later — has, of course, denied the 'charge'. Meanwhile, will the B.B.C. abide by its version of the story?

EDWIN FIELDFARE-MORRIS.

WARNING NUMBER ONE

by JOHN MITCHELL

In furtherance of the 'Our Country, Our Credit' campaign, I urge all readers to ask their Member of Parliament and the local Conservative Associations to certify the Statement contained in the letter below, which I sent to the Chairman of my local Conservative Association. This is an important step to take in the run-up to the next General Election. I also believe that we need to bring to bear all the moral force we can mobilise. That is our appropriate weapon.

* * * *

INVITATION: In my letter of November 2nd to Julian Critchley, our M.P., a copy of which was sent to you, he was invited, if he really believed it, to certify the following statement as untrue. You will see that I have certified it as *true*:—

THE STATEMENT: "The addition to the money supply of £6,000 million in 1981, acquired from *overseas* customers when paying for goods and services exported from the U.K. *in excess* of imports, was non-repayable and interest-free. If, *instead* of this money, £6,000 million had been obtained from the Bank of England as non-repayable, interest-free credit and had been used to finance Government expenditure *in lieu of* the same amount of indirect taxation, thus leaving £6,000 million in the hands of U.K. customers, *through lower prices,* to buy an equivalent amount of goods and services, the rate of inflation would still have declined.

"I, John Mitchell, do certify that the above statement is true and that it is the way to increase effective consumer demand without inflation."

THE RESULT: This morning, November 10th, I have heard from Julian Critchley. He is not willing, and indeed is not able, to certify the statement as untrue. A similar willingness, without exception, is being demonstrated by Treasury and other Ministers, as it is by the Prime Minister's personal economic adviser, Alan Walters.

SUPPRESSION: The evidence which proves the truth of the statement has been sent to you from time to time. The overwhelming weight of that evidence and the fact that, if known to the British people, it would be politically impossible for a British Government *not* to order the Bank of England to provide non-repayable credit to finance Government expenditure, thus removing the power of international bankers over British Governments, is, of course, the reason there is an effective surpression (evident to all eyes) throughout the whole of the national media of all mention of the possibility of using non-repayable bank credit. That is the power the bankers have.

YOUR HONOUR AND YOUR OPINION: Naturally there is nothing dishonourable about anyone holding an opinion about any subject under the sun. However, it is an altogether different matter when mere opinion is used as the justification for policies which are imposed on other people — policies which gravely affect their welfare and security. *Then* there is an unquestionable moral obligation on those who do so to make sure that those opinions are firmly based on facts.

LICENSED BY THE BANKERS: The Thatcher Government has a licence to govern from the international bankers with one proviso, namely, that it does nothing to interfere with the power of the bankers. There is nothing fanciful about that assertion. The 'Our Country, Our Credit' Group has a virtual admission of that fact from the Treasury. All Mrs. Thatcher's utterances on the economy are either drafted or monitored by agents of the bankers in the Treasury or 10 Downing Street.

"From the time I took office as Chancellor," said Gladstone, "I began to learn that the State held an essentially false position as to finance . . . The Government itself was not to be the substantive power in matters of finance, but was to leave the Money Power supreme and unquestioned" (Morley's *Life of Gladstone*). That position has been continued down to this day. A former Cabinet Minister of the inner ring had this to say about proposals to interfere with the power of the bankers: "I can assure you that no British Government would remain in office three weeks if it attempted to put them into practice."

That situation, taken in conjunction with the bankers' power over the media, provides the *explanation* why Ministers and M.P.s tell blatant lies about the economy. But it most emphatically does *not* provide either them or the Conservative Party workers and supporters in the constituencies with an *excuse* to tell, or be a party to telling, the British people lies.

As to the importance of the issue, well, Critchley himself describes it in the *Daily Telegraph* (11/11)82) when he retails the view of the N.A.T.O. Supreme Commander, General Rogers: *"Without* an early recourse to nuclear weapons . . . an actual four per cent increase in defence budgets . . . would, he

reckons, be required . . . There's the rub," says Critchley, "because in a period of general recession one can see what a struggle there will be to extract the money from hard-pressed treasuries."

"Rub" or no rub, the real point, which the Critchleys of this world prefer to ignore is that there is no lack of *spare* manpower or *spare* skill or *spare* production capacity. And that, by the use of non-repayable bank credit, can be brought into use without either an increase in taxes *or inflation.*

NOISOME COIN: Yes, *or inflation.* Are *you* willing to certify the Statement (see above) as untrue? *If not,* you are faced with a question of honour — of honourable conduct, or which we have recently had an outstanding example provided by our Servicemen in the Falklands. The price they were willing to pay, and which many of them paid, in order to conduct themselves honourably was to sacrifice life and limb. Are *you,* for reasons of personal expediency and opportunism and a false and misplaced loyalty to dishonest politicians or out of a craven lack of moral courage, going to repay those men with the noisome coin of betrayal? That is what being a party to telling the British people lies about the economy is. You dislike my plain speaking? I could not care less. Your dislike could not come near the intense dislike I have for people who, out of a lazy irresponsibility, jeopardise the welfare and security of others and of our country. If you cannot certify the Statement as untrue, your irresponsibility will be proved. *This is a warning.*

It is with deep regret that we belatedly record the death of Colin Howard Jones, a fellow Executive member with John Mitchell of the 'Our Country, Our Credit' Group. Aged 83, he was a life-long Social Crediter and had been a friend of the *Candour*-League movement since the 1950s. — R. de B.

THE BISHOP AMONG THE BLUEBELLS

Some of the "qualities" required to become a successful Bishop in the contemporary Church were revealed in a *New Statesman* review of *Chanctonbury Ring,* Mervyn Stockwood's recently published autobiography. The review also shed light on the Establishment patronage bestowed on this left-wing cleric (he has been a contributor to the Communist *Morning Star*), as these extracts show:

"When the Head Master of Eton (Robert Birley) invited him, Stockwood, to go there as a chaplain, the right-wing Provost made him withdraw the invitation. The B.B.C. considered appointing him head of religious broadcasting . . . In 1959 Harold Macmillan made him Bishop of Southwark. Southwark is the Cinderella diocese of the Church of England . . . He seems to have enjoyed it (though he records his deep distress at having to unfrock a clergyman for sexual lapse). In the House of Lords he supported homosexual law reform. He urged the Church of England to ordain women priests . . . He developed his powers of telepathy and entered into communication with the dead . . . He urged his parochial clergy to remarry the divorced . . . He protested against apartheid in South Africa and homelessness in Southwark."

Chanctonbury Ring, the review claims, contains splendid photographs. One shows the Bishop happily driving a dodgem car. His passenger is Lord Longford, who looks very glum. In another, Stockwood is "unaccountably standing among the Bluebell Girls"!

ARGENTINA AND THE INNOCENTS

Madam — There are some other points about the future of the Falklands (*Candour,* November 1982):

1. The Junta knows the British are not the real enemy.

2. No great harm would appear to have been done provided the Junta remains in control since they appear to have contained the revolution, although they had to dispense with the politicians in order to do so, which does not endear them to some people.

3. If it is really intended to control the South Atlantic it will need, at least, a friendly Argentina as in World War II, when Argentine shoulder flashes were to be seen over here.

4. Since Argentina is not an abortion state, Falklands children would presumably have been safer under the Junta.

COMMANDER P. R. WARD, Petersfield, Hants.

RISING is a new publication discussing politico-philosophical topics. For a sample copy, send 20p. to Rising Press, BCM-Kursall, London WC1V 6XX.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Subscribe Today !

U.K.	**£4.00**
Overseas airmail	**£4.50**
U.S.A. Dollar Rate	**$10.00**

Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants GU33 7DD

Published by Candour Publishing Co. (Editor: R. de Bounevialle), Forest House, Liss Forest, England and Printed by Farnham Printing Co. Ltd.